

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reexamination of the captioned application is respectfully requested.

### **A. SUMMARY OF THIS AMENDMENT**

By the current amendment, Applicants basically:

1. Amend independent claims 7 and 15.
2. Respectfully traverse all prior art rejections.

### **B. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS**

The Examiner has taken the position that U.S. Patent 6,259,691 to Naudus anticipates claims 1, 2 and 4, alleging that Naudus discloses H.323 gatekeeper 22 and local gateway 40 as an authentication proxy, citing particularly col. 9, line 39+ of Naudus. *See, e.g.,* enumerated paragraphs 10 – 17 of the March 10, 2004 Office Action. Admitting that Naudus does not teach entry of end-user information by a non-proprietary protocol, the Examiner has turned to a combination of Naudus and U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al. for rejecting claims 3, 5 and 6 under 35 USC §103(a). *See, e.g.,* enumerated paragraph 22 of the March 10, 2004 Office Action.

The Final Rejection, without specifically addressing newly added and more detailed claims 7 – 22, cryptically stated that "all claims are rejected under the same bases as in the previous Office Action". The Examiner made the curious observation that "Applicant does not address the main issue: the reason for having a new version of H.323 was to replace and/or supplement the old version".

Applicants respectfully again submit that it is incorrect to conclude that a transition from H.323 version 1 to version 2 has prompted the solution now claimed. The advent of H.323 version 2 with its H.235 security does not solve the many practical implementation problems, some of which are addressed in the specification (*see, e.g.,* the last two paragraphs of page 1). The advent of H.323 version 2 may have created new

opportunities, but does not teach or suggest the specific implementation claimed by Applicants.

Naudus and/or the postulated Naudus/Krishnaswamy combination do not teach or suggest the authentication proxy element or arrangement of the independent claims 7 and 15. Naudus discloses H.323 RAS message exchange between an end-point (represented by the local gateway 40) and gatekeeper 22, without expressing any concerns whatsoever with regard to an authentication problem that will be encountered in a network where the end-points and the gatekeeper operate with the different versions of the H.323 standard. Independent claims 7 and 15 both require that the gatekeeper operate according to H.323 version 2, but that the end-point does not (e.g., is "without H.323v2 or H.235 authentication support").

Naudus' gateway 40 cannot be an authentication proxy as alleged, since Naudus' gateway 40 corresponds to an endpoint. Moreover, whatever authentication is performed by Naudus is instead performed by server 26 rather than gateway 40. And yet Naudus' server 26 is not involved in any of the activities related to the exchange of H.323 RAS messages, and therefore cannot be the authentication proxy of claim 7 or claim 15.

Further, independent claims 7 and 15 (as now amended) both require that the authentication proxy

...receive from the end-point of the end-user, authentication data comprising an end-user password and an end-point network location specification, the authentication data being transmitted to the authentication proxy using a second protocol different from said first protocol

Applicants submit that the use of a second protocol to transmit authentication data to an authentication proxy is not taught or suggested in either applied reference. The

Office Action properly admits that Naudus lacks such teaching, and makes an unavailing combination with U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al.

The postulated Naudus/Krishnaswamy combination fails for many reasons, including the fact that U.S. Patent 5,999,525 to Krishnaswamy et al. does not teach or suggest the use of a non-H.323 protocol for transmitting authentication data from its H.323 terminals. In this regard, the Office Action's citation of col. 136, lines 56+ is in the context of a call flow described in conjunction with Fig. 19C for multipoint video conference calls. Although Krishnaswamy's users may be presented with a web page format for entry of identification information, clearly the transmission of the elicited information from the H.323 terminal is over the H.323 protocol, not over a second protocol. *See, e.g.,* col. 136, lines 39+.

### **C. MISCELLANEOUS**

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.


Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

RÆSTAD et al  
Serial No. 09/655,871

Atty Dkt: 3842-3  
Art Unit: 2134

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:   
H. Warren Burnam, Jr.  
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsh  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100